

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action objected the Specification as the substitute amendment is made for incorrect paragraph. The Office Action rejected claims 1, 5-6, 8 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker (US 5,379,379) in view of Mills (US 5,497,355) and Pollak (US 6,618,724). The Office Action further rejected claims 2-3 as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Mills, Pollak and Mann (US 5,954,813). The Office Action also rejected claim 4 and 9 as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Mills, Pollak and A.A.P.A. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and states clearly how the application distinguishes from the combination of the citations, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Objections

The Office Action objected the Specification the substitute amendment is made for incorrect paragraph. In order to correct the informalities, paragraph 0018 is restored and paragraph 0023 is amended. The numbers and contents of the paragraphs are in accordance with the published patent application.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

[35 USC 103 discussion]

After entering the amendment in the claims, claim 1 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak at least because ***combination of Becker, Mills and Pollak does not disclose, teach or suggest the feature of “...wherein said first section read address and said second section read address are compared respectively before they are combined”*** as claimed in claim 1. More specifically, the Becker does not teach the read address is received sequentially by a bus interface unit as a first and second section. In Mills, the multiplexed addresses 550 are steered by address mux 520, and the steered row and column are combined in address latch 530 and output as a single address 570 that can be provided as the single external address (column 13, lines 3-13). Accordingly, the single address 570 is provided after row address (first section read address) and column address (second section read address) **both** being received, and nothing is mentioned that the row address and the column address can be used in a separate way to perform any function that reduces operation time.

Considering Pollak, a string comparison algorithm is provided where characters are compared sequentially. However, although the characters of the string are received by using the method provided in Becker and Mills, no any evidence can be found in Becker, Mills and Pollak which teaches those with ordinary skill that **the characters are compared before all characters**

are received. In other words, Pollak may provide a two step comparison, however, the two step comparison, according to Mills and Becker, are performed after the whole string is received. By using this different technique between the present application and the cited references, the present application saves more time than prior arts did.

In conclusion, *Becker and Mills compares data after data are totally received. Pollak is deemed to make the compare operation after the whole string being received because teachings of Becker and Mills are combined therewith, and no evidence support that the operation are compared before the data are totally received..*

Accordingly, combination of Becker, Mills and Pollak does not form the basis for all obviousness rejection on claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak.

Since claim 1 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, claims 5-6, which depend on claim 1 and are rejected basing on the same prior arts, are patentable as a matter of law.

Claim 8 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak at least because the reason stated for claim 1 since both claims contains features that can be distinguished from those prior arts and is rejected basing on the same prior arts and reasons, respectively.

Since claim 8 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, claim 10, which depends on claim 8 and is rejected basing on the same prior arts, are patentable as a matter of law.

Claim 2 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of Mann. Combination of Becker, Mills and Pollak does not form the basis for all obviousness rejection on claim 1 as set forth above. Further, Mann does not disclose the same feature of **“...wherein said first section read address and said second section read address are compared respectively before they are combined”** as claimed in claim 1, which is depended by claim 2. Therefore, combinations of Becker, Mills, Pollak and Mann does not form the basis for all obviousness on claim 1.

In other words, claim 1 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills, Pollak and Mann. Claim 2 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of Mann as a matter of law at least because the reasons set forth above. For at least the same reason, claim 3 is found patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of Mann as a matter of law.

Claim 4 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of APA because claim 1 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak as set forth above, and APA does not provide the technique of **“...wherein said first section read address and said second section read address are compared respectively before they are combined”** as claimed in claim 1, either. Accordingly, combination of Becker, Mills, Pollak and APA does not form the basis for all obviousness rejection on claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 is patentable over Becker, Mills, Pollak and APA as a matter of law.

Claim 9 is patentable over Becker in view of Mills and Pollak, and further in view of APA for the same reason as stated for claim 4. Therefore, claim 9 is patentable as a matter of law at least because the combination of those prior arts does not provide a rational reason to reject claim 8, which is depended by claim 9.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 8 patently define over the prior art reference, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-6 and 9-11 patently define over the prior art as well.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,454
Docket No.: 8327-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-6 and 8-11 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

July 14, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw